BOOK REVIEWS.

OUTLINE STUDY OF LAW.—By Isaac Franklin Russell, D. C. L., LL.D., Professor of Law in New York University. Third Edition. New York: Baker, Voorhis & Co. Pp. xix, 344.

The principal fault to be found with Professor Russell's little book is that it masquerades under a false title and in a deceptive garb. It should be bound in the green cloth of the essayist instead of law buckram, and should have been entitled, "Rambling Reflections of a Jurist," or "Scintillations from a Legal Luminary," instead of "Outline Study of Law." For it is neither a "study" nor an "outline" of law, nor can it possibly serve the purpose announced in the preface, "a first book in law and a general introduction to the whole body of American jurisprudence." Title, form and announced purpose apart, the little volume answers its real purpose well enough. No sage and serious-minded person looks for discipline in law or for exposition of legal doctrine to a course of lenten lectures delivered by a brilliant lawyer and wit to a women's law class, and in this compendium and syllabus of such a course nothing so serious and out of place as legal instruction is to be found. Instead, we have the easy discourse of a cultivated man, equally interested in books and in affairs, upon a great number of topics, some of them having to do with the law and more of them with the conduct of life; a philosophy not too profound, a learning not too high for human nature's daily food. And what a range! From strenuous living, as exemplified in the prize-ring and the football field, to the Austinian theory of sovereignty, from codification to contingent remainders, from the Pentateuchal jurisprudence to the Hague Conference of 1899. The lectures, as a whole, are decidedly clever, are smartly written, and, though superficial, are by no means flippant or trifling. If accuracy, instead of picturesqueness and raciness, had been a desideratum, the reference to the doubtful *jus primæ noctis* (page 260) might well have been omitted, and the good taste of certain passages on pages 305 and 330 is more than doubtful. There are minor inaccuracies enough, especially where accuracy is of the essence of the matter, as in the treatment of the feudal system; but the book is, in general, sound and reliable. There are many who like this sort of thing and many more who would be benefited and stimulated by it; and while it will drive no one to the serious study of law, it may well turn the general reader from his newspaper and magazine to the more inviting aspects of sociology, politics and jurisprudence. This, whether intended or not, is a real service and goes far to redeem the book from the reproach which its too pretentious title and aim must visit upon it.

HAND-BOOK OF THE LAW OF BILLS AND NOTES.—By Charles P. Norton, Lecturer on Bills and Notes in the Buffalo Law School.

Third Edition. By Francis B. Tiffany, St. Paul, Minn. West Publishing Co. 1900. Pp. x, 553.

The fact that this book has reached a third edition raises a strong presumption in its favor—a presumption which is not repelled by a careful examination of its contents. Its editors, however, do not claim for it the merit of originality. In his preface to the first edition, Professor Norton described the work as a collation "from the best text-writers and the leading cases" of "the most apt statements of those principles of negotiable bills and notes which will most frequently come before the student in his practice." That edition, he also stated, was "intended, not for the practitioner, but only for students in law schools and law offices." Although the present edition is intended for the practitioner as well as for students, Mr. Tiffany frankly acknowledges his obligations to his predecessors in this field of law, especially to Professor Ames, whose Index and Summary at the end of his great collection of cases is commended in terms of well-deserved praise. Whether, after such frankness, the editors were at liberty to appropriate the language of Professor Ames, without indicating by quotation marks or by reference to the Summary, that the language was his, is a question upon which there may be a difference of opinion. An example of the practice under discussion is found on page 29, where the following sentences are reproduced verbatim from page 827, Sec. 5 of the Summary; but without quotation marks or any reference to Professor Ames or the Summary: "A promissory note is a new obligation, and not simply evidence of an old obligation. An acknowledgment of indebtedness is evidence of an old obligation, but creates no new obligation."

A rather novel feature of the first edition was sacrificed, when the work was changed from a treatise for students only to a handbook for practitioners as well. The problems appended to each chapter of the text for students' drill were expunged. In the place of these problems much new matter has been inserted with no little deftness, including a large array of citations; and the Negotiable Instruments Law has been printed in an Appendix. "At the suggestion of many teachers" we are told in the preface to this edition "The publishers have adopted the device of printing in bold type in the foot notes and text, the names of all cases there cited which are to be found" in the leading collections of Cases on Bills and Notes. This device has its advantages, but occasionally it gives to a page the appearance of suffering from a bad attack of hysterics.

In the very first section two blunders in dates arrest the attention of even a cursory reader. The statute of 3 and 4 Anne. C. 9, is ascribed to the year 1705 instead of 1704, and 20 Car. II, is referred to as 1868, instead of 1668. These errors are due probably to careless proofreading; but, to whatever cause ascribable, they do not tend to inspire confidence in the accuracy of the book. Barring errors of the character referred to, the work appears to be a trustworthy reproduction of the views of Ames, Chalmers and Daniels, with the addition of some authorities not cited by them.

READINGS IN THE LAW OF REAL PROPERTY.—An elementary col-